



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,916	06/14/2001	Messaoud Benantar	AUS920010320US1	8358

7590 11/23/2004

Joseph R. Burwell
Law Office of Joseph R. Burwell
P.O. Box 28022
Austin, TX 78755-8022

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,916

Applicant(s)

BENANTAR ET AL.

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) * | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on 06/14/2001. Claims 1 – 21 were received for consideration. No preliminary amendments to the specification were filed. Claims 1 – 21 are currently being considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 10 – 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramasubramani et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,233,577).

Regarding Claim 1, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a digital certificate within a data processing system (Fig. 2 and 3), the method comprising:

receiving a certificate revocation list (Column 11 line 53 – Column 12 line 12);
and

in response to receiving the certificate revocation list, automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from a certificate repository (Column 12 lines 13 – 28 and Column 13 lines 12 – 32).

Regarding Claim 10, Ramasubramani teaches and describes an apparatus for managing digital certificate (Fig. 2 and 3), the apparatus comprising:

means for receiving a certificate revocation list (Column 11 line 53 – Column 12 line 12); and

means for automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from a certificate repository in response receiving the certificate revocation list (Column 12 lines 13 – 28 and Column 13 lines 12 – 32).

Claims 2 and 11 are rejected as applied above in rejecting Claims 1 and 10. Furthermore, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a digital certificate within a data processing system (Fig. 2 and 3), further comprising:

extracting a certificate serial number from the certificate revocation list, wherein the certificate serial number has been associated with the digital certificate by the certifying authority (Column 3 lines 48 – 59 and Column 12 lines 13 – 28); and

requesting removal of the digital certificate from the certificate repository using the certificate serial number of the digital certificate (Column 12 lines 13 – 28).

Claims 3 and 12 are rejected as applied above in rejecting Claims 1 and 10.

Furthermore, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a digital certificate within a data processing system (Fig. 2 and 3), further comprising:

receiving a certificate revocation announcement message (Column 11 line 53 – Column 12 line 12); and

extracting the certificate revocation list from the certificate revocation list announcement message (Column 12 lines 13 – 28).

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected as applied above in rejecting Claims 1 and 10.

Furthermore, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a digital certificate within a data processing system (Fig. 2 and 3), wherein the digital certificate and the certificate revocation list are formatted according to X.509 standards (Column 10 lines 9 – 46).

Claims 6 and 15 are rejected as applied above in rejecting Claims 1 and 10.

Furthermore, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a digital certificate within a data processing system (Fig. 2 and 3), wherein a registration authority receives the certificate revocation list and generates certificate removal request (Column 12 lines 13 – 28 and Column 13 lines 12 – 32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 5, 7 – 9, 14 and 16 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,233,577, hereinafter “Ramasubramani”) in view of Grimmer (U.S. Patent Number 5,774,552, hereinafter “Grimmer”).

Regarding Claim 7, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a digital certificate within a data processing system (Ramasubramani Fig. 2 and 3), the method comprising:

receiving certificate revocation list, wherein the certificate revocation list identifies at least one digital certificate that has been revoked by a certifying authority

(Ramasubramani Column 11 line 53 – Column 12 line 12);

extracting a certificate serial number from the certificate revocation list, wherein the certificate serial number uniquely corresponds to a digital certificate

(Ramasubramani Column 3 lines 48 – 59 and Column 12 lines 13 – 28); and

in response to receiving the certificate revocation list, automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from an LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol)

directory using the extracted certificate serial number (Ramasubramani Column 10 line 9 – 46; Column 12 lines 13 – 28 and Column 13 lines 12 – 32). Ramasubramani discloses using X.500 directory where the directory is organized hierarchically (Ramasubramani Column 10 line 25 – 46) and does not explicitly disclose LDAP directory. However, Grimmer discloses a method for retrieving, verifying, using (managing) and interfacing with an LDAP directory for authentication certificates responsive to a search criteria message (Grimmer Column 4 lines 19 – 31 and Column 6 lines 36 – 57). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramasubramani by Grimmer to arrive at the claimed invention by having received the certificate revocation list and automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from a directory that has hierarchical information structure as taught by Ramasubramani and logically replacing with the LDAP directory as taught by Grimmer (see Grimmer Column 6 lines 36 – 57). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ramasubramani by Grimmer as discussed above because in a certificate management system LDAP (which is based on the standards contained within the X.500 standard) supports TCP/IP which is necessary for any type of Internet access, LDAP is an open protocol and also because it is a simpler version of X.500.

Regarding Claim 16, Ramasubramani teaches and describes an apparatus for managing digital certificate (Ramasubramani Fig. 2 and 3), the apparatus comprising:

means for receiving a certificate revocation list, wherein the certificate revocation list identifies at least one digital certificate that has been revoked by a certifying authority (Ramasubramani Column 11 line 53 – Column 12 line 12);

means for extracting a certificate serial number from the certificate revocation list, wherein the certificate serial number uniquely corresponds to digital certificate (Ramasubramani Column 3 lines 48 – 59 and Column 12 lines 13 – 28); and

means for automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from an LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) directory using the extracted certificate serial number response to receiving the certificate revocation list (Ramasubramani Column 10 line 9 – 46; Column 12 lines 13 – 28 and Column 13 lines 12 – 32).

Ramasubramani discloses using X.500 directory where the directory is organized hierarchically (Ramasubramani Column 10 line 25 – 46) and does not explicitly disclose LDAP directory. However, Grimmer discloses a method for retrieving, verifying, using (managing) and interfacing with an LDAP directory for authentication certificates responsive to a search criteria message (Grimmer Column 4 lines 19 – 31 and Column 6 lines 36 – 57). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramasubramani by Grimmer to arrive at the claimed invention by having received the certificate revocation list and automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from a directory that has hierarchical information structure as taught by Ramasubramani and logically replacing with the LDAP directory as taught by Grimmer (see Grimmer Column 6 lines 36 – 57). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ramasubramani by

Grimmer as discussed about because in a certificate management system LDAP (which is based on the standards contained within the X.500 standard) supports TCP/IP which is necessary for any type of Internet access, LDAP is an open protocol and also because it is a simpler version of X.500.

Regarding Claim 19, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a computer program product on a computer readable medium for use in a data processing system for managing a digital certificate, the computer program product comprising:

instructions for receiving a certificate revocation list, wherein the certificate revocation list identifies at least one digital certificate that has been revoked by certifying authority (Ramasubramani Column 11 line 53 – Column 12 line 12);

instructions for extracting certificate serial number from the certificate revocation list, wherein the certificate serial number uniquely corresponds to a digital certificate (Ramasubramani Column 3 lines 48 – 59 and Column 12 lines 13 – 28); and

instructions for automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from an LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) directory using the extracted certificate serial number in response to receiving the certificate revocation list (Ramasubramani Column 10 line 9 – 46; Column 12 lines 13 – 28 and Column 13 lines 12 – 32).

Ramasubramani discloses using X.500 directory where the directory is organized hierarchically (Ramasubramani Column 10 line 25 – 46) and does not explicitly disclose LDAP directory. However, Grimmer discloses a method for retrieving, verifying, using (managing) and interfacing with an LDAP directory for authentication certificates

responsive to a search criteria message (Grimmer Column 4 lines 19 – 31 and Column 6 lines 36 – 57). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramasubramani by Grimmer to arrive at the claimed invention by having received the certificate revocation list and automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from a directory that has hierarchical information structure as taught by Ramasubramani and logically replacing with the LDAP directory as taught by Grimmer (see Grimmer Column 6 lines 36 – 57). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ramasubramani by Grimmer as discussed above because in a certificate management system LDAP (which is based on the standards contained within the X.500 standard) supports TCP/IP which is necessary for any type of Internet access, LDAP is an open protocol and also because it is a simpler version of X.500.

Claims 5 and 14 are rejected as applied above in rejecting Claims 1 and 10. Furthermore, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a digital certificate within a data processing system (Fig. 2 and 3), wherein the certificate repository is an LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) directory (Ramasubramani Column 10 line 9 – 46). Ramasubramani discloses using X.500 directory where the directory is organized hierarchically (Ramasubramani Column 10 line 25 – 46) and does not explicitly disclose LDAP directory. However, Grimmer discloses a method for retrieving, verifying, using (managing) and interfacing with an LDAP directory for authentication certificates responsive to a search criteria message

(Grimmer Column 4 lines 19 – 31 and Column 6 lines 36 – 57). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramasubramani by Grimmer to arrive at the claimed invention by having received the certificate revocation list and automatically requesting removal of the digital certificate from a directory that has hierarchical information structure as taught by Ramasubramani and logically replacing with the LDAP directory as taught by Grimmer (see Grimmer Column 6 lines 36 – 57). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ramasubramani by Grimmer as discussed above because in a certificate management system LDAP (which is based on the standards contained within the X.500 standard) supports TCP/IP which is necessary for any type of Internet access, LDAP is an open protocol and also because it is a simpler version of X.500.

Claims 8, 17 and 20 are rejected as applied above in rejecting Claims 7, 16 and 19. Furthermore, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a digital certificate within a data processing system (Fig. 2 and 3), further comprising:

receiving a certificate revocation announcement message (Column 11 line 53 – Column 12 line 12); and

extracting the certificate revocation list from the certificate revocation list announcement message (Column 12 lines 13 – 28).

Claims 9, 18 and 21 are rejected as applied above in rejecting Claims 7, 16 and 19. Furthermore, Ramasubramani teaches and describes a method for managing a

Art Unit: 2136

digital certificate within a data processing system (Fig. 2 and 3), wherein the digital certificate and the certificate revocation list are formatted according to X.509 standards (Column 10 lines 9 – 46).

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-232-3795.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pramila Parthasarathy
November 18, 2004.


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100